

General Assembly

Raised Bill No. 6705

January Session, 2009

LCO No. 5070

05070____JUD

Referred to Committee on Judiciary

Introduced by: (JUD)

AN ACT CONCERNING HABEAS CORPUS REFORM.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

- Section 1. (NEW) (Effective October 1, 2009) Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, 1 of this act apply to any application for a writ of habeas corpus filed on 3 or after the effective date of this section that is brought by or on behalf 4 of a person who (1) has been convicted of an offense, as defined in 5 section 53a-24 of the general statutes, in order to obtain such person's 6 release by challenging his or her conviction or sentence, or (2) has been found not guilty by reason of mental disease or defect pursuant to 8 section 53a-13 of the general statutes and committed to the jurisdiction 9 of the Psychiatric Security Review Board in order to obtain such 10 person's release by challenging such commitment.
- Sec. 2. (NEW) (*Effective October 1, 2009*) The remedy of habeas corpus is not a substitute for and does not affect any remedy incident to the proceedings in the trial court or direct review of the conviction. Except for the remedies of appeal, petition for a new trial, sentence review in accordance with section 51-196 of the general statutes,
- sentence reduction or discharge in accordance with section 53a-39 of

- 17 the general statutes and the authority possessed by the sentencing
- 18 court at common law to correct an illegal sentence, the remedy of
- 19 habeas corpus as provided for in sections 1 to 5, inclusive, of this act,
- 20 comprehends and takes the place of all common law, statutory and
- 21 other remedies available prior to the effective date of this section for
- 22 challenging the validity of a conviction, sentence or commitment and
- 23 shall be used exclusively in place of such remedies.
- Sec. 3. (NEW) (Effective October 1, 2009) (a) A claim for relief raised
- 25 in an application for a writ of habeas corpus, or in an amended
- 26 application, shall be procedurally barred and no court may decide the
- 27 claim if it was raised and decided, either on the merits or on
- 28 procedural grounds, in any earlier proceeding or it could have been
- 29 raised but was not raised:
- 30 (1) At any time prior to the imposition of sentence in the proceeding
- 31 that resulted in the applicant's conviction or commitment;
- 32 (2) In a direct appeal from the proceeding that resulted in the
- 33 applicant's sentence or commitment; or
- 34 (3) In a previous habeas corpus proceeding challenging the same
- 35 sentence or commitment.
- 36 (b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section,
- a court may hear a claim if:
- 38 (1) The applicant demonstrates good cause for his or her failure to
- 39 bring the specific claim in the earlier proceedings and actual prejudice
- 40 resulting from that failure. For purposes of this subsection, an
- 41 applicant shows good cause by identifying an objective factor external
- 42 to the defense that impeded his or her ability to raise the specific claim
- 43 during the earlier proceedings, and shows actual prejudice by
- 44 demonstrating that the failure to raise the claim resulted in a finding of
- 45 guilt, a sentence or a commitment so infected by error that it violates
- 46 due process. In addition, if proven, the ineffectiveness of counsel for

- failing to raise the specific claim prior to the imposition of sentence in the proceeding that resulted in the applicant's conviction or commitment, or on direct appeal, may constitute good cause and
- commitment, or on direct appeal, may constitute good cause and actual prejudice;
- (2) The applicant alleges the existence of newly discovered evidence, including scientific evidence, that could not have been discovered by the exercise of due diligence by the applicant or the applicant's counsel at an earlier proceeding, and the evidence is not cumulative to evidence presented at trial, is not for impeachment purposes and establishes by clear and convincing evidence that the applicant is innocent of the offense or offenses for which he or she was convicted; or
 - (3) The applicant's claim for relief is based upon a new interpretation of federal or state constitutional law by either the Supreme Court of the United States or the Supreme Court of this state that was previously unavailable and is retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review.
 - Sec. 4. (NEW) (Effective October 1, 2009) (a) No application for a writ of habeas corpus shall be allowed if filed: (1) More than three years after the date that the sentence was imposed or the commitment ordered if no direct appeal was taken, or (2) more than one year after the date of (A) the final order of the last appellate court in this state to exercise jurisdiction on a direct appeal or the termination of such appellate jurisdiction, or (B) the denial of a petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States or issuance of said court's final order following the granting of such petition; whichever is later.
 - (b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, a court may hear a claim if the applicant establishes due diligence in presenting the claim and:
- 77 (1) The applicant establishes that a physical disability or mental

78 disease precluded a timely assertion of the claim;

- (2) The applicant alleges the existence of newly discovered evidence, including scientific evidence, that could not have been discovered by the exercise of due diligence by the applicant or the applicant's counsel prior to the expiration of the three-year period for the filing of an application for a writ of habeas corpus, and the evidence is not cumulative to evidence presented at trial, is not for impeachment purposes and establishes by clear and convincing evidence that the applicant is innocent of the offense or offenses for which he or she was convicted; or
- (3) The applicant's claim for relief is based upon a new interpretation of federal or state constitutional law by either the Supreme Court of the United States or the Supreme Court of this state and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review.
 - (c) A new three-year period shall not commence upon a resentencing that results from an order of the review division in accordance with section 51-196 of the general statutes, an order reducing a sentence or discharging a defendant in accordance with section 53a-39 of the general statutes or an order issued pursuant to the sentencing court's authority at common law to correct an illegal sentence. Any claim for relief based upon such resentencing must be brought within one year of the date that the new sentence was imposed.
- Sec. 5. (NEW) (*Effective October 1, 2009*) (a) The provisions of section 51-296 of the general statutes shall not apply at a proceeding initiated by the filing of a second or subsequent application for a writ of habeas corpus. The court before which a second or subsequent application is pending may, if it determines that the grounds for relief raised in the application are not frivolous, that the interests of justice will be furthered and, after investigation by the public defender or his or her office, that the applicant is indigent as defined under chapter 887 of the general statutes, designate a public defender, assistant public defender

- or deputy assistant public defender or appoint counsel from the trial list established under section 51-291 of the general statutes, to represent such indigent applicant.
- 113 (b) The ineffectiveness or incompetence of any counsel who 114 represented the applicant in an earlier habeas corpus proceeding shall 115 not be a ground for relief in a second or subsequent application.
- 116 (c) For the purposes of this section, "a second or subsequent 117 application" means an application for a writ of habeas corpus filed 118 after a first application for a writ of habeas corpus is filed.
- Sec. 6. Subdivision (2) of subsection (a) of section 52-466 of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective October 1, 2009, and applicable to any application made on* or after said date):
 - (2) An application for a writ of habeas corpus claiming illegal confinement or deprivation of liberty, made by or on behalf of an inmate or prisoner confined in a correctional facility as a result of a conviction of a crime, shall be made to the superior court [, or to a judge thereof,] for the judicial district [of Tolland] in which the conviction, sentence or commitment being challenged was entered.
- Sec. 7. (NEW) (*Effective October 1, 2009*) In any habeas corpus proceeding pending in the courts of this state on September 30, 2009, the law in effect prior to October 1, 2009, shall govern such proceeding.

This act shall take effect as follows and shall amend the following sections:		
Section 1	October 1, 2009	New section
Sec. 2	October 1, 2009	New section
Sec. 3	October 1, 2009	New section
Sec. 4	October 1, 2009	New section
Sec. 5	October 1, 2009	New section

123

124

125

126

127

128

Sec. 6	October 1, 2009, and applicable to any application made on or after said date	52-466(a)(2)
Sec. 7	October 1, 2009	New section

Statement of Purpose:

To provide for the more efficient administration of justice and protect the rights of victims of crime.

[Proposed deletions are enclosed in brackets. Proposed additions are indicated by underline, except that when the entire text of a bill or resolution or a section of a bill or resolution is new, it is not underlined.]